



CWP-3688 of 2021 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

227 CWP-3688 of 2021
Date of Decision:31.07.2024

BalaPetitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior DAG, Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in this petition is for quashing the action of the respondents of orally rejecting and not considering the claim of the petitioner for appointment under Ex-gratia policy dated 02.08.2019, Annexure P-5, of the State of Haryana and issuing Ex-gratia payment vide order dated 06.02.2020, Annexure P-2.
2. Learned counsel submits that the husband of the petitioner was working in a Group-D in the Forest Department at Jhajjar who was regularized vide order dated 13.04.2007 as amended on 18.06.2014, however unfortunately passed away on 20.10.2016. The Ex-gratia amount of Rs.23,654/- with effect from 20.10.2016 to 31.12.2022 was credited into her



CWP-3688 of 2021 2

account on 06.02.2020. However, she was keen on getting the appointment on compassionate grounds in terms of the Instructions dated 02.08.2019, Annexure P-5, which was applicable since the claim was pending. He, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is ready to refund the amount received till date or can be adjusted in case she is considered for compassionate appointment in terms of the instructions, with regard to which a representation stating the aforesaid facts will also be submitted, which may be directed to be decided in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel has no objection to the limited prayer made.

4. In view of the aforesaid and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this petition is hereby disposed of with a direction to the respondents that in case the petitioner submits a representation within a period of four weeks, the same shall be decided within a period of four months thereafter in accordance with law. Upon doing so, after notice and hearing offered to her, and if found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to her interest, the same shall contain reasons and the petitioner shall be free to seek legal redress.

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

July 31, 2024
dinesh

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No